DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 037 JC 770 078

AUTHOR Golemon, R. B.
TITLE Deans of Instruction and Faculty Development in Four Small Rural Junior Colleges in Texas.
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; *College Deans; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Inservice Programs; *Junior Colleges; Rural Schools; School Surveys; Small Schools; *Staff Improvement; Teacher Attitudes; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Deans of Instruction; Texas

ABSTRACT

Four deans of instruction in small, rural junior colleges and four deans of instruction in large, urban junior colleges were interviewed, and faculty members from the small junior colleges were surveyed, in order to ascertain their opinions regarding faculty development procedures. It was found that: (1) deans felt in-service workshops to be essential while faculty were generally unconvinced as to the usefulness of such workshops; (2) consultants were felt to be useful by both deans and faculty; (3) varying methods of faculty evaluation were used, and in the small colleges the deans played a personal role in the evaluation process while in the large colleges where evaluation procedures were more systematic the deans' role was less important; (4) deans in small colleges tended to favor faculty exchange programs while deans in large colleges had reservations as to the [illegible]ility of such a practice; (5) tangible recognition for teaching excellence or outstanding service was almost unanimously approved by both faculty and deans; (6) faculty and deans approved of community involvement/service as a means of faculty development; and (7) overall, while there was no great difference in the opinions of faculty members and deans' perceptions as to the deans' role in the faculty development process, there seemed to be a nominal breakdown in communications resulting in some unnecessary misunderstandings. An extensive bibliography and the survey instruments are appended. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED133037

DEANS OF INSTRUCTION AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN FOUR SMALL RURAL JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TEXAS

By R.B. Golemon

The following report is an interpretation of information amassed from a study of opinions from four small rural junior college deans with some contrasting procedures used by urban junior college deans and opinions expressed by the faculties of the four rural junior colleges. The study was done to serve as a point of reference for faculty development procedures to be initiated at Ranger Junior College, Ranger, Texas where Dr. Golemon is Dean.

The procedure for assimulating the information for this study involved an interview with the deans to get their responses to the attached questions (Dean's Opinions) and a check-sheet type of response to two instruments (Faculty Opinions I and II). The interviews with the deans were done in the late summer and the teacher questionaires were presented at two separate times, one in September and one in October.

The attached summaries give the raw score tallies of the responses.

The remarks on the availability and use of personnel files may have been changed by the Buckley Amendment. The report is offered as a statement of conditions as they existed in the Fall of 1974 with the hope that it may be useful to other small colleges.

Attached is a bibliography of some recent material on faculty development.

JC 770 078

In-Service Workshops

Opinions appeared to differ between the reports from the faculties and the statements of the deans of instruction on the usefulness of in-service workshops as a developmental medium. The deans felt that the workshops were essential for faculty development and that they should be scheduled periodically. The faculties were not convinced of workshop usefulness as indicated by the fact that less than half the responding teachers reported gaining useful experience from them. Even fewer teachers indicated that the planning done for in-service workshops was adequate or well done.

Responses to other items on in-service training by the faculties seemed to indicate that teachers were not sufficiently involved in the planning of the programs. This was apparently the situation as indicated by the comments of the deans in the interviews. Three of the four deans of small junior colleges explained their planning procedures as being rather haphazard. There appeared to be no continuity in the programs. The time was used primarily for orientation and administrative convenience rather than being utilized in a well planned and properly staffed activity. It seemed that the faculties felt there should be a better utilization of their time. A study of the opinions of the faculties of large urban junior colleges would be necessary to determine whether or not this characteristic is common to other in-service workshops in Texas junior college.

Use of Consultants

Faculty reports indicate that consultants were available about half the time to visit with teachers in the workshops. One seeming oddity appeared in this item. Twenty-five percent of the responding teachers indicated they did not know that consultants were available in their college for in-service training programs. This could account for some of the negative opinions on the usefulness of in-service workshops.

A majority of the faculties felt that visiting consultants should be used system-wide so that every faculty member could have the opportunity to benefit from the consultant's comments. Statements from other junior college deans indicate that this has been successfully done with small faculties where the consultant addressed the faculty assembly and spent the remainder of his time working with the teachers in his particular discipline. Such a use of consultants is compatible with the expectations of the deans of instruction in the services they expect from a visiting specialist.

Faculties also indicated by a good majority that they consider consultants useful in in-service training programs. This gives the small rural junior college teachers an opportunity to visit with a specialist and get new information on teaching strategies, different ideas on theory, and indications of what other teachers are doing to improve their instructional competencies. Deans of instruction in the large urban junior colleges indicated their use of consultants was more on a project basis usually within a division or a department and that

the system-wide use of a consultant's services were impractical because of the time element and the number of teachers necessarily involved.

Evaluation Techniques

It seems that utilization of evaluative technique for all aspects of junior college activities is becoming more and more necessary. This is especially apparent in the instructional program and those persons instrumental in maintaining its efficiency. Shawl[1] said that this one aspect of the dean's role may be its nucleus. If appropriate and adequate evaluation techniques are sine qua non for faculty development and instructional improvement, then some of the colleges under consideration have a plethora of work to be done. There are about twelve techniques used as a part of the teaching faculty evaluation programs:

1. Classroom visitation by an administrator for evaluation purposes.
2. Classroom visitation by faculty member from the same department.
3. Classroom visitation by a faculty member from the same department and one from outside the department.
4. Classroom visitation by a faculty member from outside the department.
5. Self-evaluation.
6. Student evaluations.
7. Student team visits to the classroom.
8. Discussions between student evaluators and the teacher.
9. Discussions between peer evaluators and the teacher.

---

[1] Shawl, William F., The Role of the Academic Dean, p. 16.

10. Discussions among peer evaluators, administrators, and the teacher.

11. Evaluation of video tapes of the teaching activity.

12. Evaluations based on the achievement of the stated objectives of the teaching unit.

Then there are various combinations of these techniques so that the list could become almost limitless.

Four of these procedures seemed to have some commonality among the four small rural junior colleges: self-evaluation, some peer evaluation, student evaluation, and some administrative evaluation. Of the eight deans of instruction interviewed only three require self-evaluation; one dean of a large urban junior college and two deans of small rural colleges. Although more than half the junior colleges do not require self-evaluation, nearly two-thirds of the teachers reported that they do self-evaluation annually. This is one indicator that the faculty members realize the importance of "taking stock" of their personal growth and development. This would seem to be indicative of the professional approach a majority of the faculties take to improving their personal competency and in turn the improvement of instruction.

The other three evaluation techniques reported by the teachers were not used as frequently as the self-evaluation. Forty-one percent of the faculty members reported being evaluated by peers. Forty-five percent reported evaluations by division/department chairpersons. Forty-two percent reported evaluations by the dean of instruction. Forty-five percent reported using some kind of student evaluation instrument.

These evaluation activities are considerably below the eighty percent of the teachers who held the opinion that peer, supervisor, and student evaluations should be required of all faculty. The faculty members also indicated by a majority opinion that administrators should be evaluated annually by the teachers. The deans of large junior colleges indicated that evaluation procedures for teaching personnel were as diverse as in the small junior colleges in that they differ from institution to institution, but they seemed to be more consistent internally in that each has an established procedure administered at stipulated intervals.

The role of the dean of instruction in the large junior college is much more limited in personal involvement in the individual evaluation of teachers in that he generally sees the summaries prepared by his associates, division chairpersons, and/or evaluation committees. The dean of instruction in the small junior college is a vital part of the evaluation procedure in that he is required in most instances to make a personal evaluation of each teacher for matters of promotion, tenure, salary adjustment, and continuing employment.

One evaluation procedure that seemed to be a bit unusual is employed by one of the large junior colleges. This is a rank-order listing of the "best" half of the faculty. Presumably this identifies the best teacher, the next best, and so on down through half of the faculty with the other half being listed in alphabetical order. A study of this evaluation technique would appear to have some merit to determine its

effect on morale, its usefulness as a means of producing faculty development, and the probable influence on classroom instruction. It would seem that one of the primary purposes of evaluation in a junior college would be to determine the quality of instruction occuring in thescheduled classes. If this assumption is educationally sound, it would follow that those persons assigned the responsibility for supervising instruction would need to have some knowledge of what is done in the classes and some evidence of the effectiveness of the procedures utilized. Evaluation should produce evidence that learning occurs or does not occur.

Should the evaluator (primarily the dean of instruction in the small junior college) visit classes and discuss with the teacher classroom procedures? The researcher knows of two deans who make classroom visits as part of teacher evaluations. None of the deans interviewed for this study do this. Two questions were put to the faculties relative to the dean's discussing classroom procedures and his visiting classes. Eighty-eight percent of the teachers agreed that the dean should discuss teaching activities and techniques with them and offer suggestions. A bare majority (52 percent) agreed that the dean should visit classes as a part of the evaluation procedure.

Brawer (1973)[2] points out that there is a lack of systematic preparation for teaching in college by the graduate schools.

---

[2] Brawer, Florence B., "Selecting and Training New Teachers," Change, October 1973, p. 56.

It would seem that the beginning teacher in the small rural junior college has no choice but emulate his graduate professors in matters of classroom routines and teaching procedures if he has no formal training in such matters and his dean of instruction does not offer his professional help and advice. It appears the question of how a faculty member can develop his expertise in class management, goal development, and evaluation of student learning goes begging. One practical conclusion is that this is one area of faculty development where an administrator concerned with student learning could be useful in improving instruction.

Classroom Procedures

Why the faculty members responded by approving the dean of instruction's discussing classroom procedures by a good majority and barely endorsing his visiting classes for evaluative purposes is problematical. It could be surmised that their lack of enthusiasm for class visitation by the dean is grounded in his representing the employment aspect of administration. It could also go back to the idea that the classroom is the fiefdom of the teacher over which he has the first and last word and where he is administrator, judge, and executioner.

A surmise as to why deans of instruction are reluctant to visit classes might be that they too feel the visit would be interpreted by the faculty member as representing the employment function of administration rather than the assumption that his visit was to offer some professional help.

A study by Crory (1973)[3] may offer some help with classroom visiting for evaluation purposes. Peer visitors seem to offer less of a threat to the presiding teacher's ego so suggestions for changes or improvement can be more graciously accepted, especially when the visiting peer is known to be a master teacher with much experience and tact.

When goals are properly defined, objectives established, procedures are detailed, and the evaluation instrument to be used as a guide have been agreed on prior to a classroom visit, it may develop that classroom visitation can be one of the more useful tools in faculty growth and development.

Faculty Exchange Programs

The exchange of faculty members with another junior college in Texas seems to hold some possibilities in the thinking of the deans of small junior colleges. A beginning program already operational in one small junior college appears to be working well according to the dean of instruction.

Deans of instruction in large multiple campus junior colleges could facilitate an exchange program more readily than any other junior college but they seem to have some reservations as to its usefulness in faculty development within the system. One dean of a large urban junior college could see no real advantage in such a program. The lack of enthusiasm on the part of the deans of large junior colleges appears to

---

[3] Crory, John E., "How Do You Feel About In-Service Programs?" Community and Junior College Journal, November 1973 pp. 28-29.

stem from the hetrogeneity of their faculties which results from their size and lack of any real contact with other faculty members outside one's own department. The deans of instruction in small junior colleges usually know all the faculty members individually on a first name basis and the faculties know each other rather well which tends to make them more homogeneous. An exchange teacher on the staff of a small junior college may be more useful in faculty development in that situation than he would be on the staff of a large junior college.

Visiting another College

Closely associated with the teacher exchange program for faculty development is the frequently utilized opportunity for a faculty member to visit in the same department of another junior college. Eighty-one percent of the teachers reported they were allowed to visit another college and fifty-nine percent said they were reimbursed for the expenses incurred. Ninety-two percent of the reporting teachers considered this a useful means for gaining new insights and information. All eight deans of instruction agreed with the faculty members on the usefulness of visiting another college and each said some funds were available to finance at least a part of the expenses incurred by the teacher.

Individual Recognition

Recognition in some tangible way for teaching excellence or outstanding service to the junior college and the availability of sabbaticals received almost unanimous approval from the

small junior college faculty members and all eight of the deans interviewed. The problems in inaugurating programs in the areas stem from the absence of a practical way to finance them according to the deans of instruction. Two large urban and two small rural junior colleges have taken steps to grant tangible expressions of appreciation to outstanding members of their faculties but none has solved the sabbatical problem with anything other than a leave of absence without pay. One large junior college is in the process of preparing a funded sabbatical program for system-wide and board of regents approval. The recommendation will propose a long semester sabbatical at full pay with a priority system based on seniority and the convenience of the institution. A small rural college is also in the process of preparing a sabbatical program to be operational in four years. The four year target date will be the earliest any of the faculty will be eligible to participate.

Self-development

In the area of individual and personal efforts in self-development, statements were made and questions were asked relating to attendance at professional meetings, subscriptions to professional newspapers and periodicals, the purchase of new books for one's own professional library, and the use of the professional library available to the faculty at the junior college. Ninety-four percent of the faculty members reported subscribing to one or more professional periodicals each year and eighty-five percent reported purchasing at least one professional book in his field each year for his personal library.

Sixty-one percent reported attending at least one professional meeting each year having to do with junior college education while forty-nine percent of the faculty members said they used the professional library at the junior college more than once each month. Deans of instruction of the small rural junior colleges reported the availability of some travel funds for professional meetings off campus. Some of the small junior colleges budget a specific amount of money for travel expenses for each faculty member and the teacher has the option as to how and when it is used. The teacher determines which meetings would be advantageous to him. He may attend the state junior college teachers association convention or a meeting of people in his field of study at another time and place.

Another incentive for self-development is the way the salary schedule is arranged at all the junior colleges. Salary is usually based on a combination of graduate work and years of experience both in and outside the system where the teacher is employed. Horizontal progress from the lowest to higher salaries is generally based on the masters' degree as a minimum requirement for employment with no creditable teaching experience and the highest beginning salary based on the doctorate with some creditable teaching experience. Usually the creditable experience is limited to a maximum of five years outside the employing system. Progress within a range is generally based on years of experience in the system after initial employment.

There are two fairly common means of acquiring increments aside from longevity. These are basic allowances per month

for each graduate hour earned since initial employment and the other establishes basic ranges and movement to the next range is contingent on having earned six, nine, or twelve hours of additional graduate work since employment. These are applicable up to a terminal degree. Beyond that usually is an increment based on longevity. Thus, the maximum increments in annual salary are generated by the earning of additional graduate hours and continuing employment.

Faculty Involvement in Community Activities

Information pertinent to the involvement of the faculty members in the community and community service as a means of faculty development and involvement in the junior college responsibilities to the surrounding area brought highly favorable responses from both the teachers and the deans of instruction. Deans of both large urban and small rural junior colleges felt that it was incumbent on their respective institutions to be as active as possible in service and service-related activities in the local community. The deans of instruction in the large urban junior colleges stipulated that their programs for the community would be basically directed toward educational offerings and special efforts would be made to see that the proffered programs were not duplications of services offered by other local service organizations.

A brief examination of the communities in the Dallas County Community College District revealed that the city, county, state, and Federal agencies and active organizations offering community services totaled over one hundred separate

and distinct operations not including schools, colleges, and universities in the district. A count of the Tarrant County Junior College District showed eighty such operations. The San Antonio College District showed seventy-five and the Del Mar College District showed over fifty such service organizations.

By contrast, Donley County (Clarendon College) showed only two agencies besides the junior college and the public schools. Hill County (Hillsboro and Hill Junior College) showed three agencies. Panola County Junior College District (Carthage) showed three agencies and Scurry County (Western College, Snyder) showed four agencies.[4] Each of the small junior colleges is located in the largest city in the county (none of the county populations exceeds twenty-five thousand people) and the rural nature of the environment precludes the location of many service organizations with good financial support that is found in the large metropolitan areas. One small junior college dean of instruction described the situation succinctly when he said the junior college was the service organization in his county.

Not only are these small junior colleges located in sparsely settled counties but they are more than an hour's drive from a metropolitan area. The presence of county welfare service personnel and home demonstration agents generally cover those services offered the area except for the junior college. The faculty members of the small junior colleges

---

[4] Agency counts were taken from the telephone directories for Corpus Christi, Dallas, Ft. Worth, San Antonio, Carthage, Clarendon, Hillsboro, and Snyder.

showed their consciousness of this situation when they indicated by a twelve to one vote that the college should provide means for community service activities where no local agencies exist to do this.

The matter of social involvement in the affairs of the community was not supported as well as the service need. The eight deans of instruction indicated that this was a matter of personal preference on the part of each faculty member. The small junior college deans of instruction reported urging faculty members to participate in clubs, churches, and other social-service organizations of this nature but they did not insist on it. A majority of the faculty members indicated they should assume some social leadership roles in the community but it seemed doubtful this would attain much credence as a factor in faculty growth and development.

Training Programs for Chairpersons

The question on the intensive training programs for division/department chairpersons was put to the deans of instruction and the faculty members because of some recent experience the researcher has had by virtue of his position as director of teaching personnel. Pursuant to the current emphasis on matters of equal employment opportunity and the guidelines established as well as the occasional necessity for terminating the employment of a teacher or teachers, it was deemed advisable to determine the status of training of chairpersons among the junior college deans of instruction. From time to time it is incumbent on a dean and/or a department chairperson to recommend to the president

that certain faculty member's contracts be terminated at the end of the current term of emoloyment. It appears that most deans of instruction adhere generally to the guidelines set out by American Association of University Professors except in the case of a morals problem.

The days of oremptorially discharging a teacher without dire cause seem to be gone. Instead of advising the teacher of contract non-renewal on the last day of classes in the spring semester, current practice is to do this not later than the end of the preceding semester. (This is for non-tenured faculty. Tenured faculty is an entirely different procedure). This notice of intention to terminate the contract could possibly cause some problems--the more justifiable the dismissal, perhaps the greater the number of problems. It may tax the morale of the department and may create an unjustifiable amount of ill-will. It could create problems with student learning and the over-all continuity of the teaching program.

In some instances dismissal results in a legal plea for reinstatement. Courts have held (Anders vs. Georgetown University, 286 S.W. 2nd 78, Smith vs. Chambers, 303 N.Y.S. 2nd 609, and Kalshoven vs. Loyola University, 85 So. 2nd 34)[5] that the properly documented evaluations of personnel in an open and honest manner where lapses of acceptable performance have been demonstrated is sufficient evidence to support the decisions of the administration. Thus, the matter of intensive training

---

[5] Blackwell, Thomas E., The College Law Digest, 1974, p. 78-80.

for division/department chairpersons in evaluative techniques in employment, supervision, and faculty growth and development procedures would be of inestimable value to the dean of instruction and should have a high priority rating in his developmental activities.

In a recent study by Deegan (1974)[6] of the evaluation programs mandated by the California Legislature (S B 696), it was found that the faculty members preferred that individual records be kept confidential rather than open to public examination so long as the teacher had access to the information in his personal personnel file. A recent ruling by the Attorney General of Texas requires the availability of confidential personnel files for examination by all parties concerned. The recommendation of the California Community College Teachers Association was that evaluation instruments contain the signature of all parties involved in the critique and that the faculty member receive a copy. This procedure would obviate any contention on the part of the teacher that there was no communication of inadequacy or incompetence. The other aspect of the evaluation instrument is obvious. The faculty member would know and it would be a matter of record that he was doing acceptable or better work. This aspect should be a moral builder for the teaching staff.

It would seem to the researcher that one of the most useful items the deans of instruction could create as a means

---

[6] Deegan, William L., et al, Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report.

of implementing a good faculty development program would be a first-rate communication medium. As this research seems to indicate, there is no great difference in the opinions of faculty members and the dean's perception of his role in faculty development but there seems to be a nominal breakdown in communications resulting in some unnecessary misunderstandings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Arts and Sciences, The Assembly on University Goals and Governance, Cambridge, Mass., January, 1971.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Junior College Directory, 1972, Washington, D.C.

Astin, Alexander W. and Calvin B.T. Lee., "Current Problems in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers," Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Atherton, John W., "Expectations and Responsibilities of the Employing Colleges," Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Bayer, Alan E., "College Faculties: Le Plus Ça Change," Change," Vol. 6, No. 2, March 1974.

Behrens, Anna Jo, Higher Education With Fewer Teachers, Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C., October 1973.

Blackburn, Robert T., Tenure, Southern Regional Education Board, Monograph No. 19, Atlanta, Ga., July, 1973.

Blackwell, Thomas, E., The College Law Digest, National Association of College and University Attorneys, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Bonham, George W., "Are Our Colleges Going Broke?" Change, Vol. 6, No. 3, April 1974.

Brawer, Florence B., "Selecting and Training New Teachers," Change, Vol. 5, No. 8, October 1973.

Byse, Clark, "Identifying and Correcting Specific Evils: Role of Faculty." Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Cass, James, "Teachers and Change," Saturday Rewiew/World, November 6, 1973.

Contra, John A., "Do Student Ratings of Teachers Improve Instruction?" Change, Vol. 5, No. 3, April, 1973.

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Texas, District Tax Data, Texas Public Junior Colleges, 1971-72, August 1973. District Taxes Collected, Public Junior Colleges in Texas 1971-72, August , 1973. Educational and General Income, Public Junior Colleges in Texas, July, 1973. Public Community College Report, March, 1974.

Cornback, Lee J., "Course Improvement Through Evaluation," Readings in Curriculum Evaluation, W.C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, 1972.

Croy, John E., "How Do You Feel About In-Service Programs?" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3, November, 1973.

Davis, Bertram H., "The Faculty and Institutional Policy," The Educational Record, Vol. 47, No. 2, Spring 1966.

Day, Weldon Eugene, An Analysis of Selected Duties of Academic Deans of Public Junior Colleges, Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1968.

Deegan, William L., et al, Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report, Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges, Inc., Sacramento, Ca., 1974.

Faculty and Staff Handbook, Panola Junior College, Carthage Texas, 1973.

Frey, Peter W., "The On-going Debate: Student Evaluation of Teaching," Change, Vol. 5, No. 1, February, 1974.

Golemon, Robert B., A Critical Analysis of the Role Perception of the Dean, Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

Gould, John Wesley, The Academic Deanship, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1964.

Grable, John R., ed., Role of the Department/Division Chairmen in the Community College, Department of Graduate Education, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas, April, 1973.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education, Faculty Development in A Time of Retrenchment, Change Magazine, New Rochelle, N.Y., 1974.

Gustad, John W., "Evaluating of Teaching Performance: Issues and Possibilities," Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Hammons, James O., "Suggestions Concerning Institutional Training of New Faculty," Community College Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, July-August, 1973.

Harold, Brent, "Beyong Student-Centered Teaching," On Learning and Change, Change Magazine, New Rochelle, N.Y., 1973.

Henry, David D., "The Academic Department and Educational Change," Management Forum, Vol. 3, No.2, February, 1974.

"Improving College Teaching," Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 8, No. 24, March 18, 1974.

Johnson, B. Lamar, "We Can't Afford to Innovate," College Counterpoint, Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter, 1973.

Kellam, Samuel E., "Should Teachers Do Research?" Change, Vol. 6, No. 7, September, 1974.

Kelley, Robert, "How To Make Teaching Respectable," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 8, No. 22, March 4, 1974.

Lombardi, John, "Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Community College Instruction," Monograph Report from the Community Junior College Program, Sam Houston State University, 1973.

Mayhew, Lewis B., The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1972.

_____, Innovation in Collegiate Instruction: Strategies for Change, Southern Regional Education Board, Research Monograph No. 13, Atlanta, Ga., 1968.

Martin, Warren Brown, "How Administrators View Innovation," Change, Vol. 5, No. 7, September, 1973.

Maxwell, David K., Instructor Performance Appraisal in Community College, Division of Community College Education, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, November, 1973.

Miller, Richard I., Evaluating Faculty Performance, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1973.

Miller, W. Starr, and Kenneth M. Wilson, Faculty Development Procedures, Southern Regional Education Board, Monograph No. 5, Atlanta, Ga., 1963.

Milner, Clyde A., The Dean of the Small College, The Christopher Publishing House, Boston, 1936.

Mortvedt, Donald F., Professional Growth and Evaluation Plan at College of the Mainland, College of the Mainland, Baytown, Texas, 1973.

Ober, Richard L., Ernest L. Bentley, and Edith Miller, Systematic Observations of Teaching, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971.

Popham, W. James, Evaluating Instruction, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood, N.J., 1973.

Priest, Bill J., "Classrooms: Castles or Laboratories?" Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Purdy, Leslie, "Helping Teachers Teach Better," Change, Vol. 5, Nov. 9, 1973.

Ronan, W. W., Evaluating College Classroom Teaching Effectiveness, PREP Report No. 34, DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-9 National Center for Educational Communication, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Reynolds, James W., The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum, McCutchen Publishing Co., Berkeley, Ca., 1969.

Schulman, Benson R., et al, Guidelines for Evaluation in California Community Colleges, Innovation Committee of Los Angeles Pierce College, Norwood Hills, Ca., 1972.

Scriven, Michael, "The Methodology of Evaluation," Readings in Curriculum Evaluation, W.C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, 1972.

Shawi, William F., The Role of the Academic Dean, ERIC Topical Paper No. 42, University of California, Los Angeles, July, 1974.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Manual, Atlanta, Ga., 1974.

"Staffing Community and Junior Colleges: Text of Assembly's Report," Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 8, No. 2, December 10, 1973.

Vermilye, Dyckman, ed., Individualizing The System. Part Two. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976.

Warren, Jonathan R., "Adapting Instruction to Styles of Learning," Findings (ETS), Vol. 1, No. 1, 1974.

Wennstrom, Jon T., An Analysis of Faculty Evaluation Procedures in Accredited Community and/or Junior Colleges in the United States, Doctoral Dissertation, Baylor University, 1974.

Wilson, Richard E., "Administering Instructional Programs in the Community College," Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 49, No. 4, July, 1972.

Wilson, Richard, L., "Staff Development - Directions in the '70's," Report of the 33rd Annual Junior College Conference, Association of Texas Junior College Board Members and Administrators, Austin, Texas, November, 1973.

THE ROLE PERCEPTION OF THE DEAN OF INSTRUCTION IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Dean's Opinion

1. What is your role in organizing workshops for faculty development?
2. How are your committee assignments made?
3. What is your role in departmental conferences?
4. What is your role in faculty self-evaluation? (Required Information)
5. What is your role in faculty evaluations?
6. Do you discuss classroom procedures with individual faculty members? Groups?
7. What do you expect a visiting consultant to do?
8. What is your opinion on requiring additional graduate study? How often? Purpose?
9. What is your role in faculty writing for publication?
10. What is your attitude on faculty attendance at professional meetings?
11. What is your position on sabbaticals?
12. What do you think about the possibility and usefulness of teacher exchange programs in Texas colleges?
13. How should foreign travel be equated with additional graduate work?
14. How do you give recognition to outstanding faculty members?
15. To what extent should faculty members get involved in the social activities of the community?
16. What is the role of the college in community services?
17. How do you make faculty meetings useful periods for faculty development?
18. What is your role in keeping faculty abreast of the developments in their disciplines?

19. Do you have discretionary funds to be used for faculty development?

20. Do you plan an intensive in-service training program for division/department chairpersons in light of recent problems in employment and/or release of faculty?

21. Do your faculty fringe benefits help produce improvement in faculty development? How?

Summary

ROLE OF THE DEAN IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Faculty Opinions I.

Please indicate your opinion for each item inserting a number in the blank provided as:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. No Opinion
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Your dean should do all the planning for faculty workshops.	1	9	8	54	30
2.	Faculty committee assignments should be made by your dean.	5	36	10	42	9
3.	Your dean should schedule conferences with each faculty member at least once each semester.	35	49	11	6	0
4.	Faculty members should make a self-evaluation each year.	20	45	11	4	3
5.	Your dean should discuss teaching procedures with you.	13	59	10	15	5
6.	Your dean should suggest changes in your teaching activities.	7	52	18	18	7
7.	You should recommend consultants for faculty workshops to the dean.	30	63	8	0	1
8.	Visiting consultants should be system-wide so that every faculty member could get something from his visit.	15	50	17	17	3
9.	Each teacher should be required to do additional study at least once every three years.	25	38	15	20	4
10.	Faculty should be urged to publish professional articles.	10	17	16	47	12

		1	2	3	4	5
11.	Faculty should be required to attend at least one professional meeting each year.	31	50	6	11	4
12.	Some type of sabbatical should be available to the faculty.	49	43	7	1	0
13.	Teacher exchange programs within Texas should be available to the faculty.	13	62	26	1	0
14.	Foreign travel should be educated with professional study.	25	44	24	3	2
15.	Special recognition for individual faculty achievement should be awarded in some tangible way.	42	53	3	4	0
16.	Faculty growth involves participation in community activities.	18	63	11	8	2
17.	The college should furnish social leadership to the community.	12	42	22	18	8
18.	Where there are no local agencies, the college should provide means for community service activities.	17	58	17	8	2
19.	Annual evaluations by peers, supervisors, and students should be required of each faculty member.	23	49	11	9	10
20.	Annual evaluations of each administrator should be made by the faculty.	28	38	17	15	4
21.	Faculty growth and development is primarily a concern of the dean of instruction rather than the teacher.	2	12	8	57	23
22.	Departmental/divisional chairpersons should be responsible for the development of his/her faculty.	3	62	28	9	0
23.	The individual teacher is responsible for keeping up with current developments in his/her discipline.	58	43	1	0	0

		1	2	3	4	5
24.	Your dean should make periodic visits to your classes so he can suggest ways of improving your instruction.	7	34	23	22	16
25.	Visiting other colleges is a good way to develop new insights into your teaching.	39	58	4	1	0
26.	Each teacher should subscribe to at least one professional periodical each year.	38	51	7	2	4
27.	The college should maintain an adequate professional library.	61	39	1	1	0
28.	Each teacher should buy at least one professional book each year.	32	36	18	10	6
29.	The dean's role in faculty development is his most important function.	7	48	25	21	1
30.	Faculty meetings should be directed toward teacher development.	10	56	18	17	1
31.	The dean should have intensive training programs for division/department chairpersons.	7	50	32	12	1

SUMMARY

Faculty Opinion II

Yes (Y) No Opinion (O) No (N)

		Y	O	N
1.	Are consultants available for in-service training?	48	21	24
2.	Do you think consultants are useful for in-service training?	67	18	7
3.	Do you think your in-service training programs are useful?	38	35	20
4.	Do you think your in-service training programs are well planned?	26	40	25
5.	Does your administration allow you to visit other colleges to get ideas and information?	74	6	12
6.	Is there reimbursement from your school for expenses incurred visiting another college?	55	15	23
7.	Do you consider visiting another college a useful item in a faculty development program?	85	4	3
8.	Does your dean visit you to discuss your teaching development?	46	8	38
9.	Do you do a self-evaluation at least once a year?	59	9	22
10.	Are you formally evaluated annually by your peers?	38	9	40
11.	Are you formally evaluated annually by department or division chairman?	41	16	35
12.	Does the dean make a formal evaluation of your teaching each year?	38	22	31
13.	Do the students make a formal evaluation of your teaching?	41	9	42

		Y	O	N
14.	Do you set goals for yourself each year if self-improvement?	81	2	9
15.	If your college had sabbaticals, do your think this would help a teacher in self-development?	66	23	4
16.	Do you use the professional library more than once a month?	45	6	41
17.	Does your administration encourage participation in community affairs?	69	9	15
18.	Does your administration have occasional dinners or social affairs for the faculty and staff?	72	3	17
19.	Do you attend at least one meeting annually of a professional association concerned with junior college education?	63	3	27
20.	Do you subscribe to at least one professional periodical?	87	1	5
21.	Do you buy at least one book in your field each year?	78	2	12

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 25 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES